New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1919

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By MAIL, including Postage IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

	One Year.	Six Months.	One Month.
Daily and Sunday	$10.00	$5.00	$1.00
Daily only	8.00	4.00	.75
Sunday only	3.00	1.50	.30
Sunday only, Canada	6.00	3.25	.55

FOREIGN RATES

Daily and Sunday	$26.00	$13.70	$2.40
Daily only	17.40	8.70	1.45
Sunday only	9.75	5.12	.86

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

GUARANTEE

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein. All rights of republication of all other matter herein are also reserved.

The Test

To-day at Washington there will begin a national industrial conference. Labor, capital, the proletariat, the intellectuals, the government—all these will be ably represented. The difficulty is to get the common public represented.

Formerly it was the government's business to represent the great majority; but times and customs have greatly changed. For example, it is announced that the Department of Labor has named Bert M. Jewell to represent the public. The peace conference might as well name Lenine to plead the cause of the Russian bourgeoisie.

Mr. Jewell runs the railroad employes department of the American Federation of Labor. From that position he assisted to launch the Plumb plan, which gives to labor the privilege and profit of running the railroads and reserves to the government the responsibility and expense of owning them. He derives his notoriety from the prediction that unless all basic industries are speedily socialized, according to the same simple soviet principle, labor will see that the country is damned.

He is to represent the public!

The conference will open without a programme. It shall be free and self-determining. It is in itself a manifestation of the American impulse to get together and talk a thing out.

In all such efforts the first condition of success is a common language—not a language of the tongue iself, but of the mind and heart. One may talk revolution and another may talk Americanism, both in the same tongue, but they will not be speaking the same language. Neither will understand the other.

We take it that the fundamental concern of this conference is America. To bring beneficial results to pass, therefore, it must first establish in an unambiguous manner the traditional and enduring language of the American people. If it will do this the country will be thrilled in all its parts.

Let some one who is there to represent the public challenge all participants to a confession of political faith and propose that such as cannot stand this test withdraw.

Do they believe in our form of representative government?

Do they believe in the right of Congress to enact laws?

Do they believe that all people have a duty toward the law?

Do they concede the obligation of a minority to submit to the laws enacted by a majority?

These are elementary questions. Yet so far have we gone in our maudlin tolerance of groups and minorities who defy the laws that they cannot be answered without embarrassment by some of the most eminent participants in a national industrial conference on the state of America.

Mr. Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor—how shall he answer?

On Saturday he was heard publicly repeating his favorite dictum, namely, that labor may reserve to itself beforehand the right to break any law it dislikes. If Congress enacts the Cummins bill, in which railroad employes are forbidden to strike, organized labor will strike nevertheless, he says.

Bert M. Jewell, who is named by the Department of Labor to represent the public—how shall he answer?

In August he asserted the right of the railroad unions to throttle the whole country to prevent the enactment of a displeasing law. Specifically he said: "If Congress adopts the plan proposed by Director General Hines and President Wilson we will tie the railroads up so tight they will never run again."

To suppose that the public can be represented by a man like this is fantastic. Evidently the Department of Labor needs to be instructed in the common language of this country.

What will come of the Washington conference we do not mean to forecast. The public, whose intimations are significant, has been so far very indifferent to the idea.

What might come of it is another thing. It is an opportunity once for all to separate theories of force from the traditions of American government and to exclude them from the practice of American compromise.

We do not compromise with force.

We meet it.

And the sooner this is said in a high and authoritative manner, in the name of the public, the better it will be for the cult of force. It should worry.

The League in Massachusetts

Massachusetts is the first state in which Republican and Democratic state conventions have expressed themselves on the issue of conditional or unconditional ratification of the peace treaty with Germany. This issue has not been treated in Washington as a party one, although practically all the Republican Senators now favor conditional ratification and a majority of the Democratic Senators still oppose either reservations or amendments. The action of the two conventions in Massachusetts shows that in that state the issue is distinctly not partisan, since President Wilson's policy of ratification without modifications is acceptable neither to the Republicans nor the Democrats.

The Republican convention declared for ratification without amendments, but with "unequivocal and effective" reservations which will protect American interests and eliminate the main ambiguities in the covenant. It also condemned the Fiume settlement, the Thracian settlement and the Shantung settlement. It made no reference to the question of dominion, colony and dependency representation in the league.

The convention did not go as far as Senator Lodge has gone. He has offered and voted for amendments. But since the subject matter of these amendments can be dealt with in reservations, and probably will be so dealt with after the amendments have been defeated, his course will probably harmonize eventually with the convention's declarations. Mr. Lodge told the delegates that he would continue to support the Johnson and Moses amendments, dealing with inequality of representation in the league, and the Shantung amendment. But he intimated that not more than one formal amendment is likely to be approved.

The Democratic convention was more radical. It favored ratification only in case the covenant is "so amended as to give no other nation more votes than the United States, to protect the sovereignty of the American people, to protect the right of self-determination and to refrain from adding to the burden of peoples wanting to be free and independent." That is a broad proviso. It amounts to a complete repudiation of the "sign here" theory.

It has become absolutely clear, as Senator Lodge told the Republican delegates, that "without reservations the treaty is dead." The only business of statesmanship in the Senate is to formulate such reservations as will Americanize the covenant and nullify such of its provisions and implications as still give countenance to the notion that the league is a super-state. Once Mr. Hitchcock and Mr. Swanson abandon their hopeless fight for unconditional acceptance, the obstacles in the way of rapid action on the treaty will disappear.

A Misfit Measure

Little support has developed for the Baker-March army reorganization bill. General Wood has condemned it. So has General McAndrew, chief of staff of the American expeditionary forces. Major Tomkins McIlvaine, chairman of the executive committee of the Military Training Camps Association, wrote in reply to a request from Secretary Baker for his views: "In my opinion, the bill in its main features is thoroughly unworkable and would perpetuate our worst mistakes. . . . As a whole, the bill is really as bad as can be. It seems like patchwork—not the logical development of any practicable system."

All these authorities laid stress on the fact that a regular army of from 500,000 to 580,000 men is much too large. For peace purposes General Wood said that 250,000 men were enough; General McAndrew put the maximum at 300,000. And in time of war we should have to depend, in the main, not on the regulars, but on the drafted army.

It is doubtful whether 500,000 men could be enlisted as regulars. If they were enlisted, they would be a hindrance rather than a help in performing the main task of the army, which is to educate and organize the youth who come up each year for training. The Baker-March bill allows only three months for this work. But those who have had most to do with the training camp experiment hold that at least six months ought to be spent in instructing the annual drafts in the duties of a soldier. Says Major McIlvaine: "The universal training features of the Administration bill are not only next door to worthless from a military standpoint, but are equally valueless on the educational and vocational side."

The Baker-March measure was evidently framed to meet the demands of a policy of overseas activity. Presumably, it had an Armenian and Turkish mandate in view. It has not been openly advocated on that ground, and its supporters, consequently, have made a poor showing. Our foreign policy should be determined before our domestic military policy is. The March-Baker bill does not fit in with the domestic situation. As such a misfit its chances of adoption at this session are negligible.

Germany and the Bolsheviki

An interesting programme of German foreign policy, as conceived by the influential group of Majority Social Democrats led by Representatives Cohen and Kaliski and supported from the bourgeois camp by Georg Bernhard and the *Vossische Zeitung*, is set forth in the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, the monthly organ of the coterie, by Dr. Ludwig Quessel, one of the leading publicists of German socialism. Dr. Quessel advocates vigorously a German-Russian alliance against the "capitalist powers" of the West and against "Polish imperialism, incited by the Anglo-Saxons." He makes the point that the restoration of a united Russia, comprising not only Great Russia but the Ukraine as well, is a foremost concern of German foreign policy. This statement bears out the plea of those Ukrainian nationalists who apply for Allied sympathy and assistance on the ground that a failure to achieve independence will render the Ukraine, one of the richest countries of Europe, a helpless prey of German imperialistic intrigue.

The scheme of a German-Russian alliance against the West is an old pet of the so-called Eastern school of German statesmanship, and by swallowing the bait held out to them by the quasi-radical phraseology of Herr Georg Bernhard the Majority Social Democrats merely offer another proof of their willingness to play the old imperialist game. But Dr. Quessel's article derives additional interest from the light it throws on the relation of the old German régime and Russian Bolshevism. It deals another blow to the case of those dissenters who still refuse to consider as closed the question whether the Lenine-Trotzky clique has actually coöperated with the imperial German government.

Hans Vorst, the excellent and impartial correspondent of the *Berliner Tageblatt* in Russia, has already admitted, in connection with the publication in Switzerland of a German edition of Mr. Sisson's documents, the existence of a German-Bolshevist conspiracy. Now comes Dr. Quessel declaring that this conspiracy "is proved by its terrific consequences," and it makes no difference "whether or not we regard certain documents as forgeries."

Bolshevism, according to Dr. Quessel, is "nothing but the tyranny, assisted into power by the German policy of brute force, of a small group of persons whose régime is founded on military coercion and nothing else." It has, "with its machinery of power built upon German subsidies, . . . destroyed the established sovereignty of the Russian proletariat in order to supplant it with a so-called Soviet rule." What sovietism achieved, Dr. Quessel continues, is not socialism, but "a new bourgeoisie of thieves, robbers and smugglers." He concludes that the German as well as the European policy must be based on the overthrow of the Soviet régime, and urges an alliance of German Social Democracy with the Russian Social Revolutionaries and Menshevists.

We cannot resist the impulse to reprint on this page a cartoon from *The World*. It contains more truth than irony.

Alien Rule

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Referring to your editorial "Americanization" in to-day's issue, particularly to the clause that only 8 per cent of Russians are naturalized within a five to nine year period, etc., why should the balance of 92 per cent of Russian citizens in this country have the right to cast a vote in labor unions or any other unions that would cause the closing of an American industry?

I would suggest the passage of a law that would prevent non-citizens from participating in labor movements in so far as they might influence or be responsible for the closing of American shops. Why should a foreigner be permitted to vote to close an American institution?

This would bring about that every foreigner who is enjoying American rights, etc., will have to become an American citizen and carry a citizen's responsibility before having anything to say as to how Americans should conduct their businesses. A. L. K.

Brooklyn, Sept. 29, 1919.

The Hoarding Foreigner

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have been following with great interest the clear and impartial statements of the strike situation which have been published in your newspaper, both as news items and editorials.

It seems to me that in speaking of the living conditions and the rights of labor to have these conditions improved all of our leaders of public thought have overlooked emphasizing one of the main causes of these poor living conditions, which is merely that the foreign workingman is interested only in saving his money for his return home and not in improving his own living conditions here so as to measure up to the American standard. In your news columns on the first page this morning you discuss the fact that as the strike progresses it is developing more clearly the distinction between the American laborer and the foreign laborer, and it occurred to me that the above thought might be of value to you in developing some of your articles further along that line of discussion. J. E.

New York, Sept. 30, 1919.

The Conning Tower

The Ashford Mystery

Daisy, Daisy,
Give us your answer, do;
We're half crazy
Wondering who are you.
Thomas and Dick and Harry
Assert you're Mr. Barrie;
But I opine
A kid of nine
Was Daisy in '92.

Baseball is the greatest vicarious sport in the world. Not only is the daily enormous attendance recruited almost entirely from non-players, but also those who stand around the ticker these afternoons are, mostly, those who see only two or three games a season.

Cincinnati Fans Won't Bet Even When Offered Odds.—Evening World headline.

And why, queries Harmonica, should they?

Gotham Gleanings

—Dick Lingley is a good deal better at this writing.

—Aleck Woollcott has got a new silk shirt that is pretty beautiful, as shirts go.

—Frank Case and wife are going to visit Europe, the w. k. continent, pretty soon.

—Mr. and Mrs. Burton Green of Mt. Vernon left Sat. for a protracted trip in the West.

—Miss Zoë Akins of St. Louis is going to the theatre to-night to see Miss Ethel Barrymore in her play.

—A rumor from Washington is to the effect that Gen. P. C. March will subscribe to The Tribune pretty soon.

—Frank Ward O'Malley who was in town about a month ago has not been in town since so far as we know.

—Julius Tannen sent ye scribe some candy from San Francisco yesterday. Thanks, Julius, is our way of phrasing our gratitude.

—Charley Riegelman of here sailed for England on the Mauretania Thurs. on important business. The U. S. A. will miss him for 6 wks.

It occurs to our unversed-in-economics mind that Mr. Gary is wrong in not meeting the strike representatives. "They do not represent the majority," he says. That should make them more interesting; there is no perhaps about majority representatives.

Whether Capital and Labor will ever get closer together it is hard to forecast. Nothing, however, according to many labor representatives of our acquaintance, could be closer than Capital.

The Drama in Hartford

Sir: To Parsons Theatre, Hartford, last evening with J. C. H., to see the second performance of W. S. Maugham's new comedy, "Too Many Husbands," where I was greatly astonished at the smallness of the audience.

"How can this be?" I said to J. C. H.—remembering well the prominent citizens and w. k. church pillars who have stood in line to get seats for "The Queen of the Moulin Rouge" and other high grade attractions—"how can this be? Did not The Courant this morning say the play was highly indecent?"

"Oh, yes," explained J. C. H., "but you forget that it also said that it was remarkably clever." R. R. W.

Police Court Anthology

7

Patrolman O'Hara

I was just after serving a summons on a man
Who was driving down Prospect Avenue without lights,
And I was walking along, toward where he'd stopped,
Pushing my bicycle.
Then this defendant, here,
Came 'round the corner and bumped into me.
He broke my bicycle and hurt my leg.
He stopped his car and asked me
What I was doing in the middle of the street.
And I said, Where did you think I'd be,
Up a tree somewhere, doing my duty?

8

Frank Schmidt

There are no street lights on the avenue
Where I was driving,
And the officer had no light on his bicycle,
So I didn't see him 'til I was right on top of him.
I tried to stop, but it was too late,
And I swerved out, trying to get past.
I couldn't make it, quite, and my left running board
Scraped the back wheel of his bicycle.
He wasn't hurt at all.
He'll tell you that himself, Your Honor.
B. G., Jr.

"It takes all kinds of girls to make a world," vouchsafes Si, "including those who think W. E. Hill silly and who love John Barrymore's voice."

Some of our contribs, like paid writers, write too much and some too little. In the second class come, frinst, Smeed, Irwin, and Flaccus.

The soft smoke nuisance and the soft drink epidemic are likely to make this known as the Pretty Soft Age.

"God made the world in seven days," says the Greenville, S. C., Piedmont, "but He didn't have a Senate to deal with."

Nor did He demand a 44-hour week. F. P. A.

THE WORLD: WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1919.

"YOU DID IT!"

Books

By Heywood Broun

IN A book called "The Girl and the Job," by Helen Christene Hoerle and Florence B. Saltzberg, there is much good advice for young women who don't know what kind of work they want to do or what sort of jobs they can get. But some of the suggestions seem to us not quite so good. For instance, in the chapter called "The Writer" we find:

"Every one who has ever started to write has determined that he would write what he wished to write, and educate the public up to his standard. But the public does not wish to be educated; it wishes to be amused. If a girl intends to make her living by writing it is her business to write the kind of stuff the reading public demands. Ideals are very wonderful and as far as possible every one ought to cling to them, but ideals will never pay rent, buy food, clothes and the necessities of life."

We do not complain altogether of the cynicism of this advice, although we must admit being somewhat appalled by the suggestion that ideals should be standbys until something better turns up. It seems to us that "They shall not pass" would be a somewhat less inspiring slogan if rewritten to read, "They shall not pass if we can conveniently prevent them," or, likewise, "Don't give up the ship unless you have a previous engagement," or "Hitch your wagon to a star until the price of oats is lower." No, it seems to us that, like a good deal of advice of the same sort, Miss Hoerle and Miss Saltzberg have managed to be cynical without being shrewd. We are sick to death of editors, magazine and otherwise, who say: "I know this is terrible stuff, but I'm going to use it because it's just what the public wants."

There is no denying that the public sometimes assembles in great numbers to see bad plays and to buy bad books, just as it often falls all over itself to buy good books and see good plays, but one thing is certain: the public does not want to be patronized. With very few exceptions, successful bad books are written by men who are doing their level best and are writing not down to their public but up to it. Personally, we take no delight whatsoever in the books of Harold Bell Wright, but we don't question for a moment that Mr. Wright gives the public not what he thinks they like, but what he likes himself. If the books are overly sentimentalized it is because the qualities which Mr. Wright expresses are his own qualities. They are the qualities which he thinks ought to be in a book. If he writes badly, at least he writes sincerely and earnestly. He believes in the all-healing power of mother love just as firmly as Mr. Wells believes in the importance of good chemical laboratories in high schools. It is perfectly true that Mr. Wright could not write "Joan and Peter" and no more could Mr. Wells write "The Re-Creation of Brian Kent." We do not intend to convey a belief that Harold Bell Wright is therefore as valuable and enduring a figure in the world of letters as H. G. Wells, but at least he is in there trying.

It seems to us not only the height of folly but the height of impertinence for any author to offer the public work which is less than the best which he can do. If it doesn't satisfy him we don't see how he can expect it to satisfy anybody else. There are, to be sure, one or two authors who consciously write down to their public and manage to succeed, but this is one of the most difficult feats in the world. It is not an admirable system. It is not an easy system.

Most men who say the public wants this or the public wants that are merely vaporing. Practically nobody in the world, no, not even a magazine editor, knows with any degree of accuracy what the public wants. Public taste is much too complex and much too fluctuating to be susceptible to accurate prediction. Any writer's best chance of success is to please himself to the limit of his ability and take a chance that he is not a minority of one in the world. Moreover, although we wanted to go through this piece without any cynical reservations, we must admit that there are certain kinds of ideals which will not only pay rent, buy food and clothes, but automobiles as well. The only difficulty is that if yours are not of that sort there is almost no chance of acquiring them. In that case the writer may have to get along without food and clothes, but he has his reward. He may then, with the fullest sincerity in the world, curse the world for its folly. And, we have been informed, there was never a beefsteak in the world so satisfying to the soul of man as a healthy contempt for the Philistines. Samson slew his thousands, to be sure, with the jawbone of an ass, but we have known poets who could exterminate the whole tribe with no more than a curl of the lip.

We are also disposed to question the accuracy of Miss Hoerle and Miss Saltzberg in their chapter on press agents. "Press agents," says "The Girl and the Job," "usually are recruited from other professions, especially newspaper work, which is very good training for a press agent, for in it a girl meets all kinds of people, gains a vast amount of information and learns to write facts of interest concisely, snappily and quickly."

It is our impression that press agents meet theatrical managers, actors and dramatic editors. That they learn such important things as Robert Hilliard's favorite flower and what day of the week the theatrical supplement of "The Times" goes to press. Perhaps they do "write facts of interest, concisely, snappily and quickly," but if so they generally send such items elsewhere than to this office.

Elsie Janis has a war story in her book "The Big Show," which is new to us. "They tell a story up here," writes Miss Janis, "of a young German boy whom they took prisoner; he spoke English, and one of our fellows asked him how he thought the war would end. He thought a while, and then said: 'Well, we ought to win because we have God with us, but now that the Allies have America—ich weiss nicht!'"

The New Thinness

(From The London Times)

There are very few really amusing articles on diet. In fact, the subject is so dreary that at the mere mention of a proteid or a carbohydrate the ordinary man shudders. The thing seems to lack common sense; man does not eat carbohydrates and proteins; he does not want to.

This view has at last found an exponent, who dares in the pages of "The Practitioner" to declare boldly: "You cannot chew the end of cooked foods any more than you can ruminate raw flesh." This is addressed to "obese" persons; it comes with astonishing humor and good nature from the pen of Dr. Leonard Williams. His doctrine is that every fat person is the victim of some poison present in the body. It is known, for example, that arsenic will cause obesity. So will a hundred other poisons, and so will the toxins of disease. Fatness is thus an indication of failure to deal with the intake. The cure of fatness is the cure of the poisoning which causes it or the increase of bodily resistance to that poison.

This is a reasonable and interesting standpoint. The writer declares:

"Toxins gain the upper hand, and the subject becomes the object of caustic congratulations from his tailor and his traitorous friends on his increasingly benevolent appearance."

The cure suggested, however, is another matter. It is the free use of uncooked food, which for some of us, at any rate, is nearly as bad as the carbohydrates and the proteids. Uncooked foods—fruits, dairy produce, salads and nuts—contain what are known as vitamines, principles essential to life. These are said to be less plentiful in cooked foods. In the presence of the vitamines, according to Dr. Williams, the toxins, described by him as "princes of the blood," languish.

Kidding Ourselves Along

(From The Chicago News)

Happy in these troublous times is the man with a genuine buttermilk thirst.

Montessori in England

From The Tribune's London Bureau

LONDON Sept. 15.—Widespread interest has been aroused by the visit to England of Dr. Maria Montessori, the famous woman pioneer in children's education. In honor of her arrival a dinner was given under the auspices of the British Ministry of Education. Invitations were issued in the name of the Minister, H. A. L. Fisher, the Bishop of Birmingham, Sir George Kekewich, Sir Gilbert Parker and other prominent Englishmen.

Dr. Montessori stated to-day she intended to remain in England until the end of December. She has been asked to give a public lecture in one of the leading London halls and will train 250 teachers in her methods. Dr. Montessori says she received 2,000 applications for this course, which is limited to 250 persons.

Speaking on her educational ideals, Dr. Montessori states that the fatal mistake made about education has been to imagine that it means teaching. "In the past," she says, "we have tried to teach history, citizenship, and even to teach God. But it cannot be done. There should be no masters of children—only servants. All we can do is to make it possible for the child to develop itself.

"Parents make the mistake of offering themselves to their children as examples; but the child wants to become something nearer to perfection than its parents. The parents can help and guide, but they must remember they are only helpers and servants of the child.

"The woman, the mother, has been held to be the shaper of the future of humanity. It is not so; the child is the true worker of the future. The hope of humanity lies in the child. The work they do, these little ones—it is far greater than any other work.

"I am often asked what I think the child's ideal is. I believe the child if it could formulate it, would say simply: 'I want to grow up to become a man.' How few of us realize what work is involved in that task."

As to the apparatus used in her schools, Dr. Montessori said: "My apparatus, and in fact any apparatus, is only a means to an end, and the end is the self-development of the child through its interest. The child finds something to interest it, and to occupy its time, and from the moment its play begins its development begins. Each task of a child is much more than an occupation; something is born in him and expresses itself through his occupations. The child's occupations are the media for the development of the future man."

Dr. Montessori expressed surprise at corporal punishment being still persisted in in England and outlined her idea of discipline.

"The common idea is that if you leave children to do as they like they will have no discipline. The idea is perfectly correct, but my belief in individual liberty is not affected by it. Liberty, to my mind, comes with the formation of the individual. As the infant becomes interested it begins to coördinate its movements and finds that it is part of all the life around it. It wants to be interested and to be occupied. That is the beginning of discipline.

"My idea of discipline is best expressed as the sense of duty. I remember at the San Francisco Exposition my children were playing, when they heard music in the distance. Some of the children were free to run off at once, but others knew that they must stay behind and put away their playthings first. Those who were free stayed of their own accord and helped the others. Then they all went off to the music together. That is it—true discipline is self-discipline."

An admirer of the Montessori system has offered $10,000 for the foundation of a Montessori institute in England in memory of those who gave their lives in the struggle for civilization during the last five years.